

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Margaret Donzetta Suber,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 6:17-1444-TMC
v.	)	
	)	
Nancy A. Berryhill,	)	<b>ORDER</b>
Acting Commissioner of Social Security,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

Plaintiff, Margaret Donzetta Suber (“Suber”), brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), seeking judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying her claim for Disability Insurance Benefits (“DIB”) and Supplemental Security Income (“SSI”) under the Social Security Act (“SSA”). (ECF No. 1). In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02, D.S.C., this matter was referred to a magistrate judge for pretrial handling. Before the court is the magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation (“Report”), recommending that the Commissioner’s decision be reversed and remanded pursuant to sentence four of § 405(g) for further proceedings. (ECF No. 19). On June 6, 2018, the Commissioner filed notice that she would not file objections. (ECF No. 21). Suber filed no objections and the time to do so has now run.

The Report has no presumptive weight and the responsibility to make a final determination in this matter remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). In the absence of objections, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to

accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

After a careful and thorough review of the record under the appropriate standards, as set forth above, the court adopts the Report (ECF No. 19), which is incorporated herein by reference. Accordingly, the Commissioner’s final decision is **REVERSED and REMANDED** pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further administrative review as set forth in the Report.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Timothy M. Cain  
United States District Judge

Anderson, South Carolina  
June 11, 2018